

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 10, 15-19, 21-23, 25 and 26 are pending. Claims 19 and 23 have been amended. Claims 14, 20 and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 7 and 15-18, 19 and 23 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claim 14 was objected to as being dependent from a cancelled claim. Cancellation of claim 14 obviates this objection.

Claims 1, 7, 10 and 14-18) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0037266 (Schroeder) in view of U.S. Patent 5,859,971 (Bittinger et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,647,415 (Olarig et al.). Claims 3, 6, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Schroeder, Bittinger et al. and Olarig et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,852,717 (Bhide et al.). Claims 19, 22, 23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Schroeder in view of Olarig et al. Claims 21 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Schroeder in view of Olarig et al. and further in view of Bhide et al. Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of identifying a server that is one of a plurality of servers from a client terminal having a browser, a memory device and a processor, the plurality of servers and the client terminal being connectable with each other via a communications network. The method includes: a) transmitting a first request packet from the browser to one of the plurality of servers for requesting identity of an intended server maintaining a shared data file; b) receiving the first request packet at the one server and transmitting therefrom server specific information to the browser, indicating the identity of the intended server; c) receiving the server specific information at the browser; d) transmitting a second request packet from the processor containing the identity of the

intended server to the network for requesting downloading of the shared data file, whereby the second request packet is automatically routed through the network to the intended server; e) receiving the second request packet at the intended server and downloading the requested shared data file from the intended server to the processor, and storing the downloaded shared data file in the memory device; and f) transmitting from the intended server to the processor differential data representing a difference between an updated version of the shared data file currently maintained by the intended server and the shared data file that was downloaded in step (e) from the intended server to the processor. The server specific information transmitted to the browser contains the identity of a second server if the shared data file has been moved from the intended server to the second server.

In the communications network of the Schroeder reference, a plurality of E-commerce servers 28, 30, 32 and a UPC (universal product code) image file server 10 are provided. As shown in Fig. 1, the client browser 22, 24, 26 initially accesses (34) one of the servers 28, 30, 32 and receives a web page and the identity (36) of the UPC image file server 10, with which the client browser accesses (38) the server 10. Server 10 forwards an image file (40) to the client browser, which downloads the image from the server 10. The downloaded product image is called into the web page at the user terminal.

It was conceded that Schroeder contains no teaching of sending differential data representing a difference between an updated version of the shared data file currently maintained by the intended server and the shared data file that was downloaded previously. Bettinger was relied upon to remedy this deficiency. However, in view of the structure of Schroeder, there would have been no reason to make the modification proposed in the Office Action.

Bittinger et al. patent relates to CGI (common gateway interface) forms and allows the server to pass requests from a client browser to an external application. The web server returns an output from the external application to the web browser. Bittinger et al. refers to difference data corresponding to the difference between an intercepted response and a server base form.

However, there would have been no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have utilized difference data, as discussed in Bittinger et al., in Schroeder's invention. Schroeder's invention relates to forwarding image files to a client browser from an image file server. While image files may be replaced by new updated images, image files would *not* be partially changed. An entirely new image would be sent to the browser in the case of an update. Because image files would not be partially changed in any update, there would be no reason to ever send differential data in the Schroeder system as proposed in the Office Action. For at least this reason, the combination proposed in the Office Action is improper.

In view of the impropriety of the proposed combination of references, no prima facie case of obviousness has been set forth as against claim 1. The other independent claims also recite the feature relating to differential data discussed above in connection with claim 1 and are believed patentable for substantially similar reasons.

The other claims are dependent on one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Joseph W. Ragusa

Joseph W. Ragusa

Registration No.: 38,586

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas

41st Floor

New York, New York 10036-2714

(212) 277-6500

Attorney for Applicant